

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 10-12, and 14-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 4-9 and 13 are canceled. Claims 1, 10, and 14 are amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 10, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 1, 10 and 14, the Office Action states:

The limitation of sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser, is not in the specification.

Office Action, dated July 17, 2003. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The limitation of sending an HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser is supported in the present specification on page 4, lines 5-7; page 5, lines 6-7; page 8, lines 12-13; page 11, lines 5-6; page 12, lines 9-11; and, page 31, lines 13-17.

Therefore the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by *Jawahar et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6298356). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action states:

Referencing claim 1, Jawahar teaches an information processing method in an information processing system having an information terminal support server which supports collaboration of a browser loaded on a customer-side information terminal and a browser loaded on an agent-side information terminal, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent in response to a customer-side browser request, (e.g. col. 11, line 60-col. 12, line 64);

(b) determining whether or not said HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 2, line 15-col. 7, line 19-col. 8, line 6);

(c) editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 7, line 19-col. 8, line 6 & col. 19, lines 39-69);

(d) sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser, (e.g. col. 10, line 1-col. 11, line 48); and

(e) sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser, (e.g. col. 10, line 1-col. 11, line 48).

Office Action, dated July 17, 2003. Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Jawahar* teaches methods and apparatus for enabling dynamic resource collaboration. A collaboration session is established between a first client and a second client. In response to the first client issuing a request, including a uniform resource locator (URL), the response is received and cached in the session host. A second URL, pointing to the cached response, is sent to the second client.

Jawahar also teaches a Web server 66 that includes a filter 68. The filter modifies web pages, served by Web server 66. Filter service 68 may change Web page content, e.g., by adding JavaScript methods, to allow the coordination and exchange of information between customer and agent browser applications. *Jawahar* teaches that the purpose of filter service 68 is to ensure the customer and the agent view the same information. See *Jawahar*, col. 8, lines 20-39.

In contradistinction, the present invention provides a method for collaboration between a customer-side browser and an agent-side browser, wherein a response from a Web server may be edited in an information terminal support server in response to the response agrees with a predetermined condition. Claim 1 recites:

1. An information processing method in an information processing system having an information terminal support server which supports collaboration of a browser loaded on a customer-side information terminal and a browser loaded on an agent-side information terminal, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request;

(b) determining whether or not said HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition;

- (c) editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition;
- (d) sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser; and
- (e) sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser.

Jawahar does not teach or suggest determining whether an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request agrees with a predetermined condition and "editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cites seemingly arbitrary, albeit lengthy, portions of *Jawahar*. The cited portions of *Jawahar* seem to teach a feature of editing the URL in a request from a customer so that the agent browser receives a cached page. This is not equivalent to the presently claimed invention, which recites, "receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request," "editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition," and "sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser." Whether the HTTP message in *Jawahar* is cached or not, the agent receives the same content as the customer. This is in contrast to the presently claimed invention that sends the HTTP message to the customer in an **unedited** form and sends the HTTP message to the agent in an **edited** form.

The applied reference fails to teach each and every claim limitation; therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Jawahar*. Independent claims 10 and 14 recite subject matter addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons. Since claims 2, 11, and 15 depend from claims 1, 10, and 14, the same distinctions between *Jawahar* and the invention recited in claims 1, 10, and 14 apply for these claims. Additionally, claims 2, 11, and 15 recite other additional combinations of features not suggested by the reference.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

Furthermore, *Jawahar* does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. *Jawahar* actually teaches away

from the presently claimed invention because it teaches that the customer and the agent view the same Web page with the same information, as opposed to sending an HTTP message to the customer in an unedited form and sending the HTTP message to the agent in an edited form, as in the presently claimed invention. Absent the Office Action pointing out some teaching or incentive to implement *Jawahar* to send an edited form of an HTTP message from a Web server to an agent browser, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to modify *Jawahar* to reach the present invention when the reference is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive to modify *Jawahar* in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an improper use of hindsight using the applicants' disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Jawahar*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 3, 12, and 16, the Office Action states:

As per claim 3, as interpreted by the examiner, *Jawahar* does not specifically teach said command is one of "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field".

Official Notice is taken that it was common practice to insert command that are of similar nature to "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" at the time the instant invention was made.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by *Jawahar* to insert command that are of similar nature to "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" using the teaching of common practice. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to add the limitation of insert command "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" because it would be more efficient to insert commands that would be utilized in the filtering of HTTP messages that could have information that is not to be divulged to the customer-side browser.

Claims 12 and 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Office Action, dated July 17, 2003. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant traverses the Official Notice taken in the Office Action, because the prior art does not support a claim that the specific commands of "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field" were known or common practice prior to Applicant's own invention. In fact, if *Jawahar* is exemplary of the prior art, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated only to edit Web pages so that the same Web page with the same information is viewed by the customer and the client. See *Jawahar*, col. 8, lines 25-39. This is in direct contrast to the claimed commands that would prohibit the submission of forms, prohibit the alteration of forms, conceal forms, or conceal specific fields.

Furthermore, *Jawahar* fails to teach or suggest determining whether an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request agrees with a predetermined condition and "editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition," as recited in claim 1. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that specific commands were known or common practice, there is not suggestion or motivation in the prior art to combine these commands with the teachings of *Jawahar*.

In addition, the Office Action may not make modifications to the prior art using the claimed invention as a model for the modifications. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783-1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). "The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art has suggested the desirability of the modification." *Id.* In other words, unless some teaching exists in the prior art for the suggested modification, merely asserting that such a modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art is improper and cannot be used to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Such reliance is an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of applicant's disclosure.

Therefore, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive in the prior art, *Jawahar* cannot be properly modified to form the claimed invention. As a result, absent any teaching, suggestion, or incentive from the prior art to make the proposed

modifications, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through the an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's invention as a model.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are overcome.


IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: Oct 17, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Tkacs
Reg. No. 46,430
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicants

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

OCT 20 2003

OFFICIAL